



COLUMBIA
LIBRARY
COLUMNS



THE FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA LIBRARIES
publish the *Columns* three times a year at Butler Library, Columbia
University, New York 27, N. Y. Current single numbers, one dollar.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Vicissitudes of Books	1
Berkeley and Johnson: The Story of a Friendship John Murray Cuddihy	3
The Peccancies of T. J. Wise, et al. Roland Baughman	12
Rare Books and Manuscripts; Their Care, Preservation and Restoration Polly Lada-Mocarski and Laura S. Young	29
Our Growing Collections Roland Baughman	31
Activities of the Friends	38

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JOHN MURRAY CUDDIHY is former instructor in Philosophy at Columbia College and now guest lecturer at the William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry.

ROLAND BAUGHMAN is Head of the Special Collections Department in the Columbia University Libraries.

POLLY LADA-MOCARSKI and LAURA S. YOUNG are both members of the Friends of the Columbia Libraries' Committee on the Binding and Preservation of Books and Manuscripts. Mrs. Young is also Lecturer in Graphic Arts at Columbia.



COLUMBIA LIBRARY COLUMNS



The Vicissitudes of Books

TWENTY-FIVE books and documents which have been banned or destroyed, many of them considered to be among the world's great masterpieces, will be on exhibit in Butler Library until June 30. The exhibition is part of the University's Bicentennial celebration and was designed to suggest the problem of censorship and its bearing on the Bicentennial theme, "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." Among items included are Thucydides' account of Pericles' funeral oration, which was banned in 1937 in Greece; the copy of *Ulysses*, by James Joyce, which was seized as the basis for the famous 1935 test case; a first edition of *Boris Godunov*, by Alexander Pushkin, which was personally censored by Czar Nicholas I of Russia; and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, for which he was banished from Rome by Augustus Caesar in 8 B.C.

The vicissitudes of books! In this issue, Roland Baughman writes of their forging (he plans an exhibit for this summer of "the Wise Forgeries"), and Polly Lada-Mocarski and Laura S. Young warn of their fragility and susceptibility to decay. Banned, burned, forged and neglected—it is a grim picture. But some books have happier fates. So, if the reader will turn the page, he will find mention in John Murray Cuddihy's article of a volume which has defied the envious years, and still exists in our Columbia collection as a pleasant symbol of a notable 18th-century friendship and of a more humane use of books.



George Berkeley: a portrait painted by John Smibert in 1725, three years before Berkeley came to America.

Berkeley and Johnson: The Story of a Friendship

JOHN MURRAY CUDDIHY

IN A book—*La Manière de Bien Penser*—recently presented to Columbia there appears the following inscription: “S. Johnson’s book—given him by Madam Berkeley, the Dean’s lady.” There is a story behind this brief inscription. The “Dean’s lady” referred to was the wife of the Anglo-Irish philosopher, George Berkeley, Dean of Derry, later Bishop of Cloyne. The “S. Johnson” who received the book was not the English Samuel Johnson (who, every reader of Boswell recalls, contemptuously kicked a stone by way of repudiating the Bishop’s “immaterialist” philosophy), but was the American philosopher, Samuel Johnson, first President of King’s College, later Columbia University. This Johnson was no enemy to the Bishop; he was a friend and disciple.

The year 1953 saw the celebration of the Bicentennial of Berkeley’s death. In 1954 we are celebrating the Bicentennial of Columbia’s birth. This little book, finding its way into the Library at this time, is a happy reminder of the link between these two events. Behind its inscription lies a friendship, a long correspondence, and the excitement of ideas. The Library has eight of the letters that passed between these two men. From these and other equally fragmentary signposts we can reconstruct, in its main outlines, the story of this friendship.

In a “Catalogue” Samuel Johnson kept of all the “Books read by me from year to year since I left Yale College”* there is, among

* This—and all subsequent citations from the papers of Samuel Johnson—is from *Samuel Johnson: President of King’s College, His Career and Writings*, edited by Herbert and Carol Schneider (New York, Columbia University Press, 1929. 4 Vols.).

others, the following entry: "1727-28, The 5th year at Stratford. Act. 32. Dr. Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge*." We don't know why Johnson read this work of Berkeley just when he did. Perhaps he had heard that this fellow Anglican was coming to Newport, Rhode Island, the following year, and he wished to "brief" himself on the Bishop's philosophy before he met him. Perhaps it was chance. In any case, he was enormously impressed with Berkeley's *Principles*. We read in Johnson's *Autobiography* the following: "Mr. Johnson had read his *Principles of Human Knowledge* from which he had conceived a great opinion of him and it was not long before he made him a visit that he might converse with so extraordinary a genius and great scholar . . . He was admitted to converse freely on the subject of his philosophical works, and presented with the rest which he had not seen, and to an epistolary correspondence upon them. . . ."

If we turn to the Catalogue of his reading for 1727-28 we can see how avidly he reads "the rest" of the Bishop's works: the *Principles* again, the *Dialogues*, and the *Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*.

Then, from Stratford, Connecticut, a hundred miles away, he writes his first letter to Berkeley at Newport. (Berkeley was forty-three at this time: eleven years older than Johnson.) In a neat hand, he lays before Berkeley eleven difficulties he and his friends have had in understanding the "immaterialist" philosophy. He finds himself "almost convinced." But (for example) does not this philosophy render the human body, which "seems from the make of it to be designed for an instrument . . . of conveying the images of external things to the perceptive faculty within," a superfluous instrument? Is not our idea of distance based on a definite, measurable, external distance, the distance "for instance, between Rhode Island and Stratford? Truly I wish it were not so great, that I might be so happy as to have a more easy access to you, and more nearly enjoy the advantages of your instructions." Johnson admits to being confused by the upheaval this philosophy

makes in his thoughts "since I am, as it were, got into a new world amazed at everything about me."

Berkeley excuses his tardy reply two months later by pleading "a gathering or imposthumation in my head" and thanks Johnson for the "objections of a candid thinking man." He promises to send him his *De Motu*; he proceeds to submit "these hints" (i.e., further ideas) which "he enjoys giving to thinking men, who have leisure and curiosity to go to the bottom of things. . . ."; and he suggests that Johnson read his works two or three times over.

This Johnson duly does, as we can see from his reading list of that year. His *Autobiography* speaks of "several visits" with Berkeley, "and on each spent as much time with him at his house, as he could possibly be spared from home." We know next to nothing of what went on during these visits. Probably interminable philosophical discussions. An indication of this is given at the close of Berkeley's second reply to Johnson: "If at any time your affairs should draw you into these parts, you shall be very welcome to pass as many days as you can spend at my house. Four or five days' conversation would set several things in a fuller and clearer light than writing could do in as many months." It was during one of these visits, when Berkeley was writing his *Minute Philosopher* against infidels and atheists, that Johnson perhaps expressed surprise at the Bishop's insight into these "worldly" thinkers, for he writes in his *Autobiography*: "He had, as he told Mr. Johnson, been several times in their clubs in quality of a learner and so perfectly knew their manner. . . ." The letters themselves make only one reference to these discussions. Johnson writes: "I think I once heard you allow a principle of perception and spontaneous motion in beasts."

But as one reads through all the correspondence and wades through the thickness of its ideas and argumentation one can feel the genuine affection breaking in. After all, the purpose of Berkeley's stay in America (viz., to await funds from the English Parliament to found a College in Bermuda) had failed. His philoso-

phy had been ridiculed on the Continent and anything but well received in England. And here, in America, he finds an ardent and noble follower. It must have consoled him. The *Autobiography* recounts: "The Dean being about to leave America, Mr. Johnson made him his last visit on which occasion he expressed a real friendship and gave him many very valuable books and they parted very affectionately and he condescended to hold a kind correspondence as long as he lived. He left Boston in September, 1731." Just before he sails for Boston to embark for England Berkeley hastily writes Johnson a note in which he tells of leaving behind "a box of books" which he desires be given to "such lads" at the College of New Haven (later Yale) "as you think will make the best use of them." Why does Berkeley desire to "be useful to" the "College of New Haven"? He tells Johnson: "The more so as you were once a member of it."*

The subsequent correspondence has little to do with philosophy. The contents may be summarized roughly as follows:

Berkeley disposes of his Newport farm, the annual income to go to Yale lads who deserve it, who are good in classics, and who pass an examination in the presence of Johnson.

He sends over 1000 books for the Library at New Haven.

He is about to send Johnson "a treatise against those who are called 'Free Thinkers' . . . but on second thoughts suspect it might do mischief to have it known in that part of the world what pernicious opinions are boldly espoused here at home."

Several letters of Johnson inform Berkeley of religious conditions in America, and of the improvement in classical scholarship due to the Bishop's benefactions. He writes of the wave of religious enthusiasm that follows in the wake of the preacher Whitefield. Perhaps he had

* Johnson writes that he had "retained a kindness" for Yale, his Alma Mater, despite its Rector; he writes in his *Autobiography*: Mr. Johnson "was frequently there [at New Haven], and to all appearance was respectfully treated by Mr. Williams, then Rector, though he knew him to be a zealous dissenter, a great enemy of the Church [Anglican] and of a very insidious temper."

taken a tip from Berkeley, for he goes *incognito* to some of these fire and brimstone meetings. He is an Anglican and he is a little appalled by what he sees: Convulsions and cramps seize people "even those who came as mere spectators" and "even without their minds being at all affected."

Then there is that part of the correspondence dealing with the founding of the College at New York (Columbia). Just as the Bishop had given "hints" to be observed in philosophy, so in 1749, he gives "the following hints" on how to found Columbia. There are eleven hints in all. He first of all suggests that the founders not apply to England for charters and statutes "but to do the business quietly within themselves." He thinks it should have a President and two Fellows, and says: "I should conceive good hopes were you at the head of it." As is well known, this "hint" was carried out. The Bishop says that the Greek and Latin classics should be emphasized, and adds: "But the principal care must be good life and morals to which (as well as to study) early hours and temperate meals will much conduce." In connection with the hint as to "temperate meals" for Columbia lads, it is interesting to note that twelve years later Johnson and a committee of three, appointed by the governors of King's College, drew up a "Bill of Fare for Every Day in the Week" [See illustration over leaf.] One cannot help but feel, as one reads the 'Bill,' that Johnson remained, in diet as in philosophy, a faithful disciple of the Bishop of Cloyne. Berkeley recommends "small premiums in books, or distinctions in habit" as a way of encouraging the students to do better. The Bishop even gives hints as to accommodations: "I would advise that the building be regular, plain, and cheap, and that each student have a small room (about 10 feet square) to himself." The College should not look for much money at the start: "A small matter will suffice to set one a-going" and it will eventually thrive, provided that they make "a handsome provision for the President and Fellows."

One further statement in the Bishop's letter is notable; under the misapprehension that Johnson has (in a letter now lost) asked for financial help in founding Columbia, he writes: "I recommended this nascent seminary to an English Bishop, to try what might be done there. But by his answer it seems the colony is judged rich enough to educate its own youth." This remark must have hurt Johnson a little, for we find him writing (on Sept. 10, 1750) that he had not intended Berkeley to "promote any collection for this intended college. The

Each Student pays 13/6 w^{ch} for
his Diet. The Bill of Fare is as
follows.

Bill of Fare

Breakfast: { Tea & Coffee - Bread & Butter
and Fruit -

Dinner

Sunday: Roast Beef & Mashing -
Monday: Leg of Mutton & Roast Veal -
Tuesday: Corn Beef and Mutton Chops
Wednesday: Peas Porridge & Beef & Mutton
Thursday: Corn Beef and Mutton Soup
Friday: Leg of Mutton & Soup
Saturday: Fish, Fish & Lamb in Sauce

Supper: { Bread and Cheese, and the
Remains of Dinner

King's College bill of fare, 1763-64, copied out by John Jay while a student there.

utmost that I had in my thoughts was that as I had heard your Lordship was collecting some books for a present to the Library of Cambridge College, I apprehended if you knew of an Episcopal College going forward in these parts, you would perhaps rather turn such a benevolent design towards founding a Library for that. . . ." As for "your Lordship's hints," Johnson is very pleased with them. The "hint" that he be the first President of Columbia is flattering, but Johnson feels he cannot afford to leave his 'Colony.' Moreover, even if he could leave, the founding had been so long delayed "that I shall be too far advanced in life to think of any such undertaking. . . ." When the trustees were nominated shortly after, Johnson gives them Berkeley's recommendations, and writes the Bishop: "They are thankful for the notice you so kindly took of what I had mentioned to you in their behalf, and will form their College on the model you suggested to me. . . ."

Only two more letters passed between them. One is a letter of Johnson to Berkeley accompanying Johnson's *Elementa Philosophica* and asking for the Bishop's corrections. The other is a reply of Berkeley to Johnson, who had asked him if he knew of Hutchinson's writings. Berkeley answers: "I am not acquainted with them. I live in a remote corner where many things escape me."

Three years later Berkeley is dead. Four years later Columbia is founded, and Johnson comes to New York to be its first president. He becomes more and more involved in administrative duties. Sorrows come to him. But he never forgets Berkeley and what he has meant to him. He has tender memories of him. William Smith, who arranged for the London edition of his *Elementa Philosophica*, wrote in the Preface: "He [Johnson] often visited the Dean while he was in Rhode Island, who was then writing his *Minute Philosopher*; and I remember, some months ago, when I was at his house in Connecticut, our author took up the book, and reading some of the Dean's rural descriptions, told me they were, many of them, exactly copied from those charming landscapes that presented themselves to his eye in that delightful island at the time he was writing."



Portrait of Samuel Johnson, President of King's College from 1754-1762, painted by an unknown artist about 1761 when President Johnson would have been sixty-five years of age.

Even as he was dying Johnson remembered Berkeley. In 1772, his son, William Samuel Johnson, writes to Bishop Lowth of Oxford: "My father often wished, and repeated it the morning of his departure, that he might resemble in his death his friend, the late excellent Bishop Berkeley, whose virtues he labored to imitate in his life, and Heaven heard his prayer; for, like him, he expired sitting up in his chair, without a struggle or a groan. . . ."

A few words in conclusion. In this account one feels, unavoidably, that "Hamlet" has been discussed and Hamlet left out. The Hamlet here, for these two men, is ideas; to each of them, ideas are immeasurably important and powerful. We have had to skirt this central fact.

But even from the little that has been said, one fact forces itself upon the attentive reader: these two men, as compared with ourselves, were ceremonious and restrained, but they were completely alive.

Each, in his wide-narrow way, endeavored to "go to the bottom of things." Each, when he got near that bottom, found a reality far richer and intrinsically more precious than the regnant 'corpuscularian' philosophy of their day allowed. "Quite at the commencement of the epoch," Whitehead writes of Berkeley, "he made all the right criticisms, at least in principle." By recurring to these two men, we can the better discover where we are.

The Peccancies of T. J. Wise, et al.

Some Aftermaths of the Exposure

ROLAND BAUGHMAN

IT IS almost exactly twenty years since John Carter and Graham Pollard revealed the fakery behind those troublesome "nineteenth-century pamphlets." Their disclosures were first published in the summer of 1934. They laid open with surgical precision the fatty layers of bibliographical misinformation surrounding the origins and subsequent histories of the pamphlets, and brought to light a series of virulent facts. It is easy enough now to ridicule the "experts" whose lack of vigilance had permitted the disease to spread to such an advanced stage—indeed, such ridiculing speedily became the favorite line with certain people who were, apparently, gifted with very clear hindsight. The simple fact of the matter is that most of us in the fields of collecting, bibliography, and librarianship were caught flatfooted by the exposure, and were dumbfounded to learn that the costly little pamphlets which we had cherished so proudly were, in reality, spurious things without honorable pedigree, without value to collectors, and without merit or significance to scholarship.

It should be clearly understood that, with one or two exceptions which came dangerously near to giving the show away before it was well begun, the forger had not tried to imitate known editions. Nor did he create texts, as most literary forgers before him had done. His contribution to the fine art of fraud was beautifully simple and direct. Selecting an authentic text that had not appeared in separate form he reprinted it with an earlier date than that of the bonafide edition; and then labored diligently to inject into the bibliographic record some gossipy cock-and-bull story of its origin—that would not conflict too seriously with the known facts.

The strength of the scheme lay in the cleverness with which the forgeries were made to look just about as they ought to have looked. Make no mistake—this forger knew his business; so well, in fact, that he successfully overrode all attacks on his pamphlets for a whole generation. Even today we would be powerless to do more than point the finger of suspicion, if Carter and Pollard had not found technical anachronisms in certain of the pamphlets—which the forger could have avoided if he had had any reason to suspect their existence. We must not forget that nearly half of the books in Carter and Pollard's list are there on negative evidence alone, and nothing concrete has appeared since 1934 to close the cases against them.

For the most part, the fabricated "rarities" contain poems, essays and similar short works by about fifteen English authors who were popular with collectors and critics during the later Victorian period. The booklets posed as rare separate printings either of well-known works that were otherwise available only in collected editions, or of obscure early contributions to periodicals and anthologies made when their authors were still struggling to reach prominence. The reason given for such separate printing was invariably that the author needed a special limited issue "to secure the copyright," or "for private circulation" among his friends. Only very seldom were they supposed to have been regularly published, because the whole purpose of the forger was to create the impression in the minds of wealthy collectors that these were important rarities, hard to find and expensive to acquire.

Although the pamphlets were variously dated from 1840 onward, not one of them could furnish a verifiable pedigree extending backward beyond the late '80's. They began to be "discovered" about the year 1888, after which new titles cropped up in the rare-book market and in specialized bibliographies at the rate of about half-a-dozen annually for the next ten years. Their appearance naturally caused considerable stir, because each new discovery displaced and deflated a published version already in circulation.

The man whose name was mentioned most frequently in connection with the discoveries was Mr. Thomas James Wise, a London business-man and book-collector with a growing reputation as a bibliographical expert in such groups as the Shelley and Browning Societies. It is true that quite frequently the "finds" were first reported by other authorities, but even then Wise's name invariably cropped up somewhere in the discussion.

That was both his strength and his weakness. In the ten years from 1888 to 1898 Wise rose to pre-eminence in the field of 19th-century English bibliography, due in no small part to his astonishing keenness in ferreting out and describing unheard-of first editions. But it was that same omnipresence in the background of the forged pamphlets which finally brought him under scrutiny, and which he was so pitifully unable to explain when Carter and Pollard published their exposure of the fraud a generation later.

Not that Wise had not had frightening moments almost from the beginning. There had been several occasions when his un-



The Literature of the Exposure, 1934-1948.

masking must have seemed dangerously close, long before Carter and Pollard came into the picture. As early as 1904 two English scholars, Cook and Wedderburn, compilers of the definitive edition of Ruskin's works in 39 volumes, flatly accused four "rare" Ruskin pamphlets, dated variously from 1849 to 1868, of being later printings designed solely to deceive collectors. And several years before that, in January, 1898, Robert Proctor, the final authority on typographical matters at the British Museum, had reported in the pages of *The Athenaeum* that William Morris's pamphlet, *Sir Galahad*, supposedly printed in 1858, could not possibly have been produced by the publishers named in the imprint, because they had never owned the type from which it had been printed. As if that were not enough, in 1901 an American book-dealer, George D. Smith, openly denounced several Tennyson and Swinburne pieces that were being fed into the market too fast to justify their reputation as valuable rarities. As late as 1920 Mrs. Flora V. Livingston of Harvard's Widener Library reversed Wise on a number of his points of priority, including his canonization of the forged "Ottley, Landon" edition of Swinburne's *A Word for the Navy*. Again, in 1922, Wise's weakness in regard to the bibliography of earlier works was castigated by Professor John W. Draper of Bryn Mawr. Draper reviewed the newly-published Wrenn Library catalogue which Wise had edited and claimed responsibility for, in the April issue of *Modern Language Notes*, devoting several pages to enumerating the errors in the work. Draper concluded, caustically, that "Some of them are merely stupid blunders; but others, unfortunately, suggest an intentional desire to mislead, and to make the items appear more important than they are."

Wise carefully kept out of the public discussions arising from these mutterings. He had had one rather close call, and he was not a man to have to learn a lesson twice. When tempted to make a hot rejoinder, he had only to recall the incident involving Stevenson's essay *Some College Memories*. That pamphlet, dated 1886, contains a short essay which had been published by T. and A.

Constable in an anthology, *The New Amphion*. When the separate made its first public appearance in an auction in 1897, fetching £12, the Constables wrote a letter to *The Athenaeum*, calling it "merely a pirated reprint, of which the sale is illegal." Despite the obvious authority with which the Constables spoke, *The Athenaeum* editors, before publishing the charges, consulted with Wise, and it was presumably he who prepared an unsigned editorial paragraph which appeared beside and in rebuttal of the accusation, but which completely ignored the main points at issue. Whereupon the Constables wrote another letter, setting forth in tabular detail their case against the pamphlet. It should have been quite clear to Wise that the matter had gone too far for anything less than direct answers to the charges, but, lacking experience and relying too much on his growing reputation, he defended the pamphlet over his own signature in the next issue of *The Athenaeum*. Having no better strategy available, he again resorted to irrelevant generalities, and there was no disguising the obvious fact that he had, after all, no real reply to the accusations. That brought him very close to disaster, for his letter evoked a sarcastic rejoinder from a third party, the internationally prominent bookseller, Frank T. Sabin. Whereupon Wise realized his dangerous position and hurriedly dropped out of the controversy; and he never again permitted himself to be drawn so deeply into the public defense of what he knew to be, in the last analysis, beyond justification.

Thereafter, Wise's published statements about the forgeries usually were woven out of irrelevant gossip and categorical pronouncements, all carefully designed to create the impression that a consistent story had been told, and that he had drawn on a vast fund of detailed information which it would be folly to challenge. When his comments are analyzed, far too many of his statements are found to be either wholly unsupported, or attributed to dead or obscure persons from whom there could be no danger of contradiction. Whenever possible, of course, facts were cited from authorities whom no one would dream of questioning. But too

often such factual citations are padding, and either have no real bearing on the matter in hand, or they have been carefully distorted, amplified, or purposely misinterpreted to suit Wise's case. He ran no great risk in doing that. The worst that could happen would be a letter of gentlemanly remonstrance from the injured party, published in the correspondence column of some learned periodical—which Wise, in his own time, could answer with a letter that would further befog the issue; and the matter would thus drag along until all concerned would be thoroughly sick of it. Meanwhile, Wise's original distortion would stand in his published bibliography, the only part of the whole business that would be remembered. This is not the magnification of a single occurrence into a generality; it happened over and over again.

In any case, the fact remains that no lasting impression was made by any of the published challenges, disquieting as they may have been to Mr. Wise and to the more thoughtful collectors who were active around the turn of the century. All of the challenges had been largely forgotten when Carter and Pollard began their investigations some thirty years later. The important thing was that Wise had never been directly implicated, nor had anyone else been convincingly accused of responsibility for *all* of the frauds. When, for example, the type facsimile of Swinburne's *Siena* (1868) was exposed in the early 1890's, it was laid at the doorstep of John Camden Hotten; on the other hand Tennyson's *The Lover's Tale* (1870)—a forgery of a piracy, by the way—was assigned to Richard Herne Shepherd. These two men, Hotten and Shepherd, seem to have alternated as whipping-boys at that time in all matters of unauthorized publication.

Nevertheless, it should be made quite clear that not all 19th-century bibliographers, dealers, and collectors were completely taken in by the fraud. On the contrary, no less than nine of the forgeries had been openly indicted and, if we may judge by mysteriously fluctuating auction records, there were murmurings against many others. The reason that the suspicions progressed no farther than they did lay simply in the fact that no one guessed the

true extent of the operations, or noticed the continuity and basic similarity that linked the pamphlets together. As a consequence, the matter resolved itself into a series of unrelated investigations, with each newly questioned book comprising a separate problem.

When Carter and Pollard took up the work, however, they were immediately struck with the fact that they were dealing, not with a series of individual problems, but with a single problem that involved a whole group of pamphlets, all connected by obvious similarities in—to use their own words—“date, format and bibliographical status,” and the “habit of turning up, in well-defined groups, in miscellaneous auction sales and in the catalogues of certain booksellers; always in fine original condition.” Before long another common factor became apparent; in the background of each pamphlet was always to be found one man, alone or with others—T. J. Wise.

The *Enquiry* which Carter and Pollard published in 1934 set out to do one thing—to establish the true status of the 50-odd pamphlets which had attracted their suspicions. When their work was done they had not only proved their cases against more than half of the suspects to their own and to most other observers’ satisfaction—they had in the meantime discovered the most likely candidate for the role of the original forger. Lacking legal proof, however, they did not openly charge Mr. Wise, but they entangled him in such a web of circumstantial evidence that, after a few Pyrrhic efforts to shift the blame, he retreated into a silence no less damaging. At the time of his death three years later he had still made no adequate explanation of his position.

Carter and Pollard’s exposure of the forgeries and the part that Wise had played had a varied reception. The early reviewers of the *Enquiry* fall readily into a few categories. There were those who exulted in the discomfiture of the libraries and wealthy collectors who suddenly found themselves owning worthless forgeries instead of rare first editions. There were those more scholarly reviewers, such as R. B. McKerrow, A. J. A. Symons, I. A. Williams, to name only a few, who saw the book for what it

was—an important step toward an era of sounder bibliographical study. But there were still other reviewers who tried to discount the whole proceeding. Most of the people in the last group were friends of Wise, or bibliographers who had in their own studies depended on his statements, and they simply could not bring themselves to accept without struggle the deadly conclusion that was forced upon them. Among these were such men as Gabriel Wells whose pamphlet “The Carter-Pollard Disclosures” appeared soon after the *Enquiry* was published. Wells made much of the fact that Carter and Pollard had brought in no clinching verdict against Wise, but had, as he thought, attacked the character of an aging man, ill and defenseless after a long life spent in the service of bibliography. Another Wise supporter was J. Christian Bay, who cried down the significance of the forged items, and in general belittled the importance of Carter and Pollard’s studies. He too pointed out that the disclosure “should never have been printed as a grand insinuation—or if you please as a mystery story without the final solution.”

Completely untypical, but nevertheless indicative of the acrimony which the exposure incited was the amazing correspondence which ran in the English *Publishers’ Circular* from December of 1934 to the following March. The unknown columnist—unknown to me, that is—who signed himself “Alpha,” deeply resented the *Enquiry’s* slur on English integrity in general and on Wise’s in particular. In trying to show that the faked pamphlets must have been of American origin, Alpha vaulted from one absurdity to another, making assumptions and flat statements without regard to the obvious facts, until, apparently, the editorial board saw the ridiculous position in which the magazine was being placed, and put a stop to his fancies. From that day to this no serious attempt has been made to discount the major guilt of T. J. Wise, although Miss Fannie Ratchford, who will be mentioned at greater length later in this discussion, has enjoyed a measure of success in her efforts to place Harry Buxton Forman and Edmund Gosse in the defendants’ box along with Wise.

It has been said that Carter and Pollard's *Enquiry* has been "perhaps the most widely reviewed book of the quarter century," and it is certainly true that the book has attracted attention from all sides, calling forth praise—as well as some criticism—from many of the most prominent students of bibliography. For the authors brought to bear on the problem a technique that had never before been applied—we must wonder why—to the study of modern books.

It may be helpful to summarize briefly the methods by which positive proof was established against the forgeries. When it became clear that none of the books had a provenance traceable to the stated date of origin (overwhelmingly suspicious when it is remembered that most of them were supposed to have been printed "for private circulation," the very kind of book which authors are most likely to autograph for their friends), Carter and Pollard searched for possible anachronisms within the texts, in the papers of which the pamphlets were made, and in the designs of the types from which they were printed. The fraudulence of five of the 50-odd booklets was determined when the forger was shown to have used a wrong version of the text or preliminary matter; and in this connection Carter and Pollard not only took full advantage of the earlier work of editors such as Cook and Wedderburn, but added some discoveries of their own.

The study of the ingredients of paper yielded some valuable data which may serve future investigators well—not only as regards the limited field of the forged pamphlets, but in the broader aspects of research involving all undated works of the related period. Carter and Pollard brought to general notice two very useful points in the chronology of papermaking: first, the date 1861, when esparto grass came into use in England as an ingredient of paper; and second, the date 1874, when the sulphite process for the manufacture of wood pulp was perfected. Both dates have withstood the cross-fire of controversy that flared up when the exposure was published. And on the evidence of those dates 22 of the suspected pamphlets were proven to have fraudulent imprints.

Investigation into type designs led Carter and Pollard into another productive field. In this instance, while the actual findings have specific reference only to a handful of pamphlets, they furnish an excellent example of modern bibliographical technique—and one which shows how much valuable work remains to be done in the typographical history of the 19th century, a period which saw the status of printing change from that of a handicraft

his guiding function
subjection? Simply
function. Let me
seem to be rightly

The forger's special type—with kernless 'f' and 'j' and wrong-font query sign. (Enlarged reproduction).

to one of our most highly-mechanized industries. Carter and Pollard's specific contribution lay in their identification of a certain mixed font of type, the discovery of the printers who had created the mixture, and the fixing of the period during which it had been in use. The purposes of this discussion will be served by simply stating that the mixture was found to consist of three elements—the body type, two special characters of an unusual design (lower case "f" and "j"), and an interrogation mark that was definitely "wrong font." The printers who created and used this three-way mixture were the Clay company of London, and the period of use was set from 1880 to 1893. (The period was later extended through the researches of the present writer to 1877 on the one hand and to 1895 on the other, without affecting the

validity of the type evidence.) Carter and Pollard were thus able to show that sixteen of the suspected books, supposedly printed from 1842 to 1873 by printers in widely separated localities, were actually not produced until much later, and originated in a single printing office. When that fact was established, the pamphlets lost all standing as the first editions which they were represented to be.

Some of the books were shown to be false by all three tests—that is, they contained anachronisms in their texts, in the constituents of their paper, and in the design of their type. Altogether, tabulation showed that thirty of the original 50-odd suspects were certainly fakes. Against the remaining two-dozen titles no positive evidence could be established. Nevertheless, twenty years have passed since the *Enquiry* was published, and not a single one of the original suspects has been removed from the list by further investigation. As a consequence the case against even those which had to be set aside as “not proved” has gained strength by default. On the other hand, only a bare half-dozen pamphlets have been *added* to the list (two by the present writer in 1936 and four “Ottley, Landon” imprints exposed by Carter and Pollard in 1946)—a tribute indeed to the carefulness and precision of the original study.

After the wave of formal reviews had spent its force, the greater implications of the disclosure began to be felt as scholars adjusted themselves to the new status of T. J. Wise. As things stand today, the forging of editions of Victorian literary works seems to be pretty fully documented, and the losses in that connection can be counted.* If we pass over the financial aspect, we are forced to

* I detest footnotes, but, since no “scholarly” article can be without at least one, this seems to be the place for mine. In 1861 Emily Faithfull & Co. produced *Victoria Regia*, an anthology edited by Miss Adelaide Proctor, who had persuaded a number of authors to contribute pieces on the understanding that the profits from the venture were to go to charity. Two of the known forgeries listed by Carter and Pollard are separate printings of contributions to *Victoria Regia*—Tennyson’s *The Sailor Boy* (1861) and Thackeray’s *A Leaf out of a Sketch-Book* (1861). Both were printed on paper not available at the purported date of issue. The story as given by Wise in his bibliography of Tennyson is that special issues of twenty-five copies of each of the items were prepared for the authors in acknowledgment of their generosity. Wise also says that a third contribution, Coventry Patmore’s

admit that nothing essential had been lost because of Wise's pamphlet forgeries. Even though the Reading 1847 imprint on the "Sonnets of E. B. B." must be disregarded—along with the pretty story that was fabricated to support it—at least the sonnets themselves remain. And the date of their first appearance in print has only to be moved along three years to 1850—which is just where it had been before Wise drew attention to his fictitious separate.

But the fact that Wise was involved in the fraud has much more serious implications. For Wise, in his half-century of collecting and bibliographical pontification, dealt in all periods of English literature from Spenser to Conrad. As a consequence, any student in whatever field who finds himself tempted to rely on Wise's categorical statements is warned of the risk that he is running. The question is no longer the relatively simple one of whether certain "rare first issues" are what they have been represented to be. It is a much larger problem, involving all phases of bibliography upon which Wise has set his stamp. That seems an almost intolerable conclusion to reach. Wise occupied the pinnacle of his profession so long that his opinions have been accepted without question by scholars who were better men than he in every respect. The full import of the disheartening warning will be realized only when one recalls the eleven large volumes of Wise's "Ashley Library Catalogue," and the fuller treatments that fill the many specialized bibliographies and the countless forewords and essays which Wise contributed during his life.

That the warning is not merely asking for trouble has been many times demonstrated. After the publication of *The Enquiry* one of the first to notice—in print, at least—Wise's wider bibliographical weakness was William H. McCarthy, Jr., then with the Wrenn

The Circles, was separately printed in the same way and for the same reason. But, so far as Carter and Pollard knew in 1934, and so far as I have been able to determine since then, *no copy of the Patmore piece is extant!* Most probably it never existed, because Patmore was not worth forging, and Wise merely created a mare's nest to bolster his two saleable fakes. But if a copy of *The Circles* should ever turn up, it will almost certainly have to be added to the list of forgeries. It remains a possibility that *all* of the Wise forgeries have not yet been isolated.

Library at Austin, Texas. In an article published in 1936, Mr. McCarthy discussed the chronological order of three known variants of the first edition of Byron's *The Corsair*, 1814. Before he had finished, he had exactly reversed the order as established by Wise in his "Ashley Catalogue" in 1922, and, in greater detail, in his *Byron Bibliography* published ten years later.

John Carter also undertook to face Wise down on his own ground. This occurred in the pages of the *Times Literary Supplement* a few months before the *Enquiry* was published, in connection with the vexed question of the four variants of Tennyson's leaflet, *A Welcome to Alexandra*, 1863. Wise had established a chronological sequence for two of the variants, not knowing of the existence of the others. Carter demonstrated that no priority of issue could possibly be established, since it was clear that the piece—a four-page leaflet—had been set up twice, both settings being printed simultaneously as a "work-and-turn" operation. When the first run was found to be insufficient to meet the demand for the poem (it was circulated widely on the occasion of Alexandra's visit to England) a second run was undertaken; but this time the forms of type were locked up in a different position. Thus all four variants are readily accounted for; but inasmuch as no corrections were made between the runs, and since the time element can be measured in days—possibly in hours—it is now impossible to say which pair of variants came first. And because no textual differences are involved the whole question becomes academic, even to collectors. One variant is as desirable as another.

In the spring of 1938 Mrs. Janet Camp Troxell published in *The Colophon* an exhaustive study of "The Trial Books of Dante Gabriel Rossetti," in which she made some important corrections of the bibliography of that author as it had been set down by Wise. Mrs. Troxell's work is typical of what must be done—Wise's writings must all be reviewed and corrected or amplified in the light of sounder and more definitive research than he saw fit to perform.

But none of the examples which I have cited reveal anything

worse than a human weakness for making honest mistakes. It is true that for decades Wise was always the first to admit that he was infallible, and it is equally true that the growing mass of evidence to the contrary is not entirely unpleasant news to younger bibliographers who are learning that, after all, everything has *not* been done. But evidence of a more ominous side of Wise's activities is growing. He was not merely a slipshod bibliographer whose work must now be done all over again. He was not merely a forger of a well-defined group of Victorian literary pamphlets, the essential value of which was doubtful from the beginning, and by means of which he was able to prey on wealthy collectors. It is now beginning to be shown that there is an entirely different aspect to his operations that has nowhere been discussed comprehensively because its existence has only recently been suspected, and because many years of research will be required before even an estimate of its possible extent can be reached.

The late Professor George F. Whicher of Amherst sounded the first published warning of the new danger in his article in *The Colophon* in the summer of 1937. He discussed what he and the late Professor John Edwin Wells had learned about the 1798 edition of Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads*—a volume which Wilfred Partington has also analyzed in his biography of Wise, originally published under the title *Forging Ahead* in 1939, and re-issued later as *Thomas James Wise in the Original Cloth*. Wise's copy of *Lyrical Ballads* has a cancelled leaf containing a correction of the text. In his bibliography of Wordsworth, Wise asserted that any copy *without* the cancel must of course be the earlier issue, but he added that such copies would seldom be found. As a matter of fact they are not at all rare, except insofar as the entire edition is rare. No other copy than Wise's (it is now in the British Museum with the rest of the Ashley Library) of the corrected variety has ever come to light. There is a very good reason for that; even in photographic reproductions the cancel shows up as an obvious piece of trumpery. The result of Wise's dictum was the creation of a false premium for all other copies than his own—a very curious

state of affairs indeed, until it is recalled that Wise, though he tried to disguise the fact, was primarily a rare-book agent.

Miss Fannie Ratchford, Librarian of the Rare Books Collections at the University of Texas, has noticed a similar instance. In an article in the *Southwest Review*, Miss Ratchford demonstrated that the rare first issue of Tennyson's *Enoch Arden*, 1864, with the variant title-page reading *Idylls of the Hearth*, is an almost certain example of fraudulent tampering. Wise and Forman had stated that, after the volume had been completely printed, Tennyson suddenly decided to change the name of the poem. Accordingly the "Idylls of the Hearth" title-page was cancelled and the "Enoch Arden" version was inserted. But Miss Ratchford has shown that the exact opposite is true, for all extant copies of *Idylls of the Hearth* have stubbed-in titles and all *Enoch Arden* title-pages are originals. The result is a manufactured "rarity," and Wise's story simply does not fit the facts.

It should be plain that problems such as those just cited are in no way related to the pamphlet forgeries; they represent an entirely different formula. The tendency to group all of Wise's operations together should be discouraged. Indeed, his direct connection with the *Lyrical Ballads* and *Enoch Arden* cancels is presumptive rather than definite. Nevertheless, whether he was responsible for the tampering, whether he took advantage of tampering by others, or whether—most improbably—he was merely the tool of even greater rascals, Wise's canonization of the faked rarities supplies the best point of departure for their exposure. The Ashley Catalogue, replete with unsupported statements, will be the standard reference in this work. Obviously, of course, not all investigations into Wise's circumstantial and categorical pronouncements will yield fresh examples of forgery or fakery. But since we don't know what to trust and what to discard, we shall have to find out the hard way, and all of Wise's work will need to be re-examined. And, fortunately, *some* investigations into what at first glance may appear to be frauds will reveal true rarities, all the more precious for having been removed from suspicion.

John Carter's exoneration of Stevenson's *The Hanging Judge*, in the scarce proof issue of 1887, is a case in point; doubtless such instances could be multiplied indefinitely. But, inevitably, some of the investigations will reveal further examples of bibliographical tampering.

So far in this discussion I have dealt only with the part played by Mr. Wise, and not at all with the vexed question of what assistance he might have had in fabricating and passing off the forgeries. I have never been able, from the beginning of my acquaintance with the exposure, to believe that Wise worked alone and single-handed, but until recently there has been nothing solid upon which to base those suspicions. The possible complicity of Harry Buxton Forman, upon whom Wise tried to thrust the blame in his letters to the *Times Literary Supplement* after the *Enquiry* was published, has been argued long and vehemently by Miss Ratchford. Her best case against him was presented in the introduction of her edition of *The Letters of Thomas James Wise to John Henry Wrenn*, published late in 1944. Her insistence brought considerable censure from reviewers, for she was not permitted to back her assertions with clinching proof—although she knew the proof existed, and had seen it. About a year later, however, she presented the supporting documents in Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer's publication *Between the Lines; Letters and Memoranda interchanged by H. Buxton Forman and Thomas James Wise* (1945). The evidence is incontrovertible—in one instance, at least (that of Tennyson's *Last Tournament*, dated 1871, but in reality not printed until 1896), Forman must have been hand in glove with Wise. But "once" does not mean "always," and there is much to support the belief that Forman was as completely in the dark about many of the forgeries as anyone else.

As for Edmund Gosse, Miss Ratchford's case against him, in the opinion of most reviewers, amounts to little more than suspicion. Many authorities differ sharply from her views. Professor W. O. Raymond of Bishop's University published a lengthy article in July, 1945, in support of Gosse. Mr. Edmund Blunden, in an article

in the *Times Literary Supplement* of September 28, 1946, seems to sum up the matter fairly in his statement that "Against Gosse, whom Miss Ratchford pursues with a wild but punitive desire, the main exhibit is a single word written in the margin of a proofsheets for one of the forgeries. I knew his handwriting well. That word is not in his hand. Even if it were, it does not prove that he knew the purpose of the printing. Wise was surely equal to that."

It is not likely that the question will ever come to anything more than this—one opinion against another. It will be well to remember, however, that Forman was finally brought to justice mainly because of Miss Ratchford's insistence in spite of almost universal dissent. She may also be right in her opinion of Gosse. But as things now stand not a shred of legal evidence against him has been brought forward.

In my own opinion very little was gained by convicting Forman, and hardly more could be expected from the (altogether unlikely) establishment of Gosse's guilt. Possibly others, so far completely unsuspected, were involved to some extent and on some occasions. To my mind the important consideration is that one person, Wise, was connected with the fraud in *all* of its aspects; and that fact gives us the needed starting point in our work of unravelling the tangle of forgeries, piracies, and altered copies which the *Enquiry* and other more recent studies have shown us exists. It may be justice to uncover the guilt of Wise's accomplices, and it may be very desirable to do so for other considerations. But that project lies in the field of biography, not bibliography. Whatever the moral issues involved in the Wise forgeries, I must admit that, speaking as a bibliographer, I am primarily concerned that the full extent of his various operations be determined, and that clean and faithful records be supplied in place of the ones which can no longer be trusted.

Rare Books and Manuscripts

Their Care, Preservation and Restoration

POLLY LADA-MOCARSKI AND LAURA S. YOUNG

The Council of the Friends of the Columbia Libraries has appointed a Committee to encourage study of the specialized problems concerned with the care, preservation and repair of rare books and manuscripts. There is an urgent need for competent advice on these questions and the Committee plans to develop this subject further from time to time in future issues of *Columbia Library Columns*. In the meantime, anyone desiring further information may write to the Committee on the Binding and Preservation of Books and Manuscripts, in care of the Friends of the Columbia Libraries.

WHAT makes a book rare—what makes it a desirable acquisition—what makes it worth preserving? There are many criteria which can be used to answer these questions. Some things are rare because they are “unusually excellent” in their workmanship or production; some because they are “exceedingly uncommon”; others because they are “of a relatively small class”; and still others are valuable, perhaps not rare, because they represent milestones in human progress, or because of their association with an individual or an institution. These are the materials that constitute, for the most part, our Collectors’ items and fill to overflowing our “rare book rooms”; these are the materials that bring joy and prestige to their owners.

Since the turn of the century the number of rare books and manuscripts which have come to this country has increased prodigiously—and is constantly increasing. Has the care and preservation of this material kept pace with its acquisition? Are the owners or custodians of all this valuable material, as well as the great wealth of Americana, properly discharging the responsibility for these holdings which are in the nature of a trust to be preserved

for future generations? The answer, unfortunately, is “no” in far too many cases.

It becomes necessary at this point to state a fairly obvious truth which has nearly been lost sight of in the care and preservation of rare library material—namely, that only qualified craftsmen can provide an adequate solution of the various problems involved.

A book that requires minor repairs today may, without proper attention, need major repairs in a few years; a mutilated page or manuscript letter, if not repaired, may even become irreparably damaged. With each passing year of indifference or neglect, the need for a constructive, integrated program within each library becomes more urgent. Broadly speaking, for such a program there must be an awareness among library administrators, or private collectors, of the necessity of initiating a long-range program to be kept up year in and year out. Such a program must, of course, be related to the over-all budget. At present the emphasis, more often than not, is placed on “acquisition” and “use,” to the detriment of care and preservation. The principal reasons for this imbalance are the insufficient attention paid to the latter aspect of librarianship in library schools and the indifference of the private collector to these matters.

It is not suggested that the collector or the librarian himself be an expert binder or restorer. Both of them, however, should be able to recognize the nature of the problem when they see leather bindings turning into powdery dust, hinges cracking, boards severed from their backs or the text badly foxed. They should have enough technical knowledge to judge the qualifications of those to whom they entrust the delicate job of preservation or restoration, and to know that the processes employed have been sound and well executed. To follow any other course is fraught with danger and may even result in serious damage to rare or irreplaceable material or its total loss.

Our Growing Collections

ROLAND BAUGHMAN

ONCE before in these pages attention was called to the fact that library exhibitions, by revealing both strengths and lacks in the collections from which they are drawn, often stimulate gifts of valuable and unusual items. Several instances of this are to be noted in the following paragraphs. Mr. and Mrs. Solton Engel, for example, knowing of our desire to hold an exhibition of children's literature next year, have presented a number of key pieces, the latest being the "Peter Rabbit" books described below. The James F. Drake firm presented an original drawing by Palmer Cox for the Alexander Hamilton exhibit, but because it was received just as the exhibit was to be closed, it is being held for the children's books display. The decision to hold during the coming summer an exhibition concerning developments that have come about since the Wise-Forman pamphlet forgeries were first exposed twenty years ago has resulted in the gift of fifteen of the forgeries—three from Mr. Howard Mott and twelve presented anonymously.

Adams Papers: Additions continue to be made to the correspondence of the late James Truslow Adams (Litt.D. 1924), the main part of which was presented by Mrs. Adams. Recently two important additions were received. Mr. Orrin G. Judd presented fourteen letters written to him by Adams between 1934 and 1942; and Mr. Henry Hazlitt added three which he had received during 1930.

Architecture: Mr. William Partridge (1887 Architecture) compiled for and presented to the Avery Architectural Library his manuscript recollections of the work of the architect McKim in

the designing of the Mall in Washington, D.C. Mr. Partridge was Chief of Staff of the Park Commission in 1901 during McKim's stay in Washington, and he saw the work unfold at first hand. The manuscript of more than 100 pages is extended by numerous clippings and other inserted matter, and comprises a unique unpublished document.

Bacon, Francis: Instauratio Magna, London, 1620. The gift of Mr. Winslow Ames (1929 C). It is a fine copy of a very scarce work, which has been in Mr. Ames' family since 1816, when it was presented to his great-grandfather, William Johnson, by Dr. Bruce (presumably the Scotch metallurgist).

Columbiana: Mr. Edmund Astley Prentis (1906 EM) and Mrs. Katherine Prentis Murphy have presented three items of singular importance in Columbia's history. One of these, an autograph letter from Benjamin Franklin to Reverend Samuel Johnson (first President of King's College), dated 27 October 1753 and concerned with Johnson's philosophical treatise, *Noetica*, has been on deposit in Special Collections for some time, the gift being formalized recently in connection with the opening of the Bicentennial celebration. Of the other items, one is a *Breviarium*, printed at Antwerp by the Plantin heirs, 1703, which had been in the library of Reverend Samuel Johnson ("liber ex dono Jacobi Laborie, M.D., Jan. 14 . . . 1723/4"). The remaining item is a copy of N. F. Moore's *Address to the Alumni of Columbia College*, 1848, inscribed by the author to the Reverend John N. McLeod (class of 1826).

Epictetus: Epictetus Enchiridion, Oxford, 1680. The gift of Mr. W. A. Lyon.

Friedman Gift: Mr. Harry G. Friedman (Ph.D. 1908) has been a faithful Friend and a regular donor. In recent months he has presented a number of important books and manuscripts: the Bible in

French, printed at Amsterdam in 1669 by the Elzeviers in two magnificent folio volumes; Samuel Daniel, *Collection of the History of England*, 1626; Mrs. John Kinzie, *Wau-Bun*, 1856; Gottfried Kleiner, *Prediger und Hirten-Stimme*, 1739; John Milton, *Paradise Regained* (with *Samson Agonistes*), 1671; John de Serres, *Generall Historie of France*, 1611; Theocritus, Bion and Moschus, *Idylls and Epigrams*, Bibliophile Society, 1905, three volumes; *Veterum Scriptorum qui Caesarum et Imperatorum Germanicorum . . .*, 1584; and a manuscript doctoral degree in canon law, granted to one Joseph de Arce Cabrera in 1642, with pendant seal.

Kendall Collection: Presented by Mrs. Christine Herter Kendall, daughter of the late Dr. Christian A. Herter (P & S 1885) who was formerly Professor of Pharmacology and Therapeutics in the College. The collection comprises an outstanding group of manuscripts, autograph letters, and portraits of important scientists, including twenty-eight letters from personages such as Stephen Hales, Helmholtz, Calmette, Liebig, Leibnitz, Darwin, Voight, Jenner, Linnaeus, Von Guericke, Faraday, and Michael Foster. Many of the letters contain data of scientific and historical importance: for example, Voight's letter of 1863 describes his method of forming blood crystals—the very method that is in use today. There is a leaf from the original manuscript of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, authenticated by his daughter, Henrietta Darwin Litchfield, and presented by her to Dr. Herter.

The collection was presented to the Medical Library through the courtesy of Dr. Hans T. Clarke, Professor of Biochemistry, who is a friend of the family.

Juveniles: Mr. and Mrs. Solton Engel (1916 C) have presented the rare first edition of Sarah Austin's translation out of the German of *The Story Without an End*, London, 1834, and a magnificent set of the first editions of Beatrix Potter's "Peter Rabbit" books. One of the latter, *The Tailor of Gloucester* (the second in the series),

contains the bookplate of Edith C. Pollock and a letter of presentation to her in which the author says, "I think if it is ever reprinted the story will be a good deal shortened." Some impression of the remarkable condition of the set can be gained from the fact that several of the volumes are still, after nearly fifty years, in their original printed glassine dust wrappers.



The Brownies at the Burr-Hamilton monument, Weehawken, New Jersey. From the original pen sketch by Palmer Cox which was given by James F. Drake, Incorporated.

Another item of juvenilia came from the firm of James F. Drake, Incorporated, with the presentation of an original pen drawing by Palmer Cox of his famous "Brownies." The drawing, the original sketch for the plate on page 55 of his *The Brownies Through the Union*, 1895, shows the various characters grouped about the monument in Weehawken, New Jersey, which marks the spot where, in the words of one of the Brownies,

“ . . . Hamilton, indeed,
Met Burr at morn, as was agreed,
And fell in that sad useless strife
That closed his bright and useful life.”

Lenin Pamphlets: Mr. Valerien Lada-Mocarski presented two exceedingly scarce and valuable booklets by Nikolai Lenin—early revolutionary pamphlets written by this leader of Bolshevik thought during a crucial period in the formative years of the movement. The titles, translated, are: *What is To Be Done?*, Stuttgart, 1902; and *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Geneva, 1904.

Manuscripts: Our efforts to build a substantial collection of the book manuscripts of recent authors continues to be met with enthusiastic response. Seven such manuscripts have been added recently.

Mr. Millen Brand (AB 1929) has presented four of his own manuscripts: *Local Lives*; *Poetry*; *Some Love, Some Hunger*; and his article “How to Read *The Human Comedy*.”

Mrs. Reginald Barclay presented the bound typescript of *Two Years Abroad, 1887–89*, written by her mother, Maria L’Hommedieu Fahys.

Miss Henrietta Mason presented the manuscript of her first novel, *White Orchid*.

Mr. Stark Young (AM 1902) sent the manuscript of his *Immortal Shadows* to be added to the file of his other manuscripts which he has presented in the past.

Daniel Gregory Mason Collection: Mrs. Daniel Gregory Mason has presented the papers of her late husband. The collection comprises more than 2,100 pieces, including some 1,350 letters, 90 business papers, 16 composition scrapbooks, 316 manuscript and printed scores, and 130 books, mostly editions of Mason’s own writings but including the works of others which he had annotated heavily.

Daniel Gregory Mason, besides being one of America's leading composers, was for many years McDowell Professor in Music at Columbia University, and was a forceful participant in musical circles not only in New York but throughout the country. This collection of his papers will therefore be an invaluable resource for scholars concerning themselves with our cultural history over the past generation.

Nevins Papers: Professor Allan Nevins has completed the transfer of selected parts of his personal and professional correspondence to Special Collections. Included in the gift are approximately 12,000 letters to Professor Nevins from various correspondents, such as James Truslow Adams, Newton D. Baker, Van Wyck Brooks, Willa Cather, Archibald MacLeish, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Carl Sandburg, Harry S. Truman, Henry Wallace, etc. In addition there are several hundred other autograph letters and manuscripts, including letters of Presidents, Civil War figures, financiers, politicians, and authors, as well as groups of material such as the Hewitt and Fremont papers. There are also voluminous notes and typescripts of materials used by Professor Nevins in the writing of his various studies, such as *The Emergence of Lincoln*, *The Ordeal of Democracy*, and *Rockefeller*.

One of the most notable of the lots in the collection is the group of twenty-one closely-written diaries of Brand Whitlock representing his years as minister and ambassador to Belgium during World War I.

Mitchell, Samuel L.: The Picture of New York . . ., 1807. Presented as a Bicentennial gift by Mr. Edward Van Winkle (1900 E).

Mendell Bequest: Through the courtesy of Miss Roslyn J. Mendell the library of the late Dr. Samuel Mendell was presented. The collection comprises nearly 600 text, reference, and serial publi-

cations in the fields of optometry, physiology, anatomy, pathology and psychology.

Raddin Gift: Mr. George C. Raddin, Jr. (AB 1930) presented three autograph letters of Pierre Menard (dated 30 July 1807, 12 August 1808, and 19 August 1809), and one autograph letter from Edmond Menard (son of Pierre) to his mother, dated 4 May 1827.

Russian Works: Professor and Mrs. Philip E. Mosely continued their presentation of useful books and serials relating to Russia and Soviet policy. The current gift numbers more than 850 items.

Wise Forgeries: The interest stimulated in the subject of the Wise pamphlet forgeries by the recent Friends program and the projected exhibition has resulted in the gift of fifteen of the pamphlets. Three of these came from Mr. Howard Mott, and twelve from a donor who prefers anonymity. Columbia now owns twenty-one of the fraudulent items, which augurs well for the success of the forthcoming exhibition.

Mr. Mott also presented three other literary first editions: two by James Branch Cabell (*The Eagle's Shadow*, 1904, first issue, and *The Cream of the Jest*, 1917); and one by Swinburne (a proof copy of Wise's limited issue of *Grace Darling*, 1893).

Activities of the Friends

Finances

DURING the period from April 1, 1953, to March 31, 1954, the Friends have contributed in cash a total of \$15,380.50. Of this, \$2,166 was given in general support of our activities and \$13,214.50 was designated for special purposes. Included in the latter category is \$1,500 given by Dr. Jerome P. Webster for the purchase of books on plastic surgery in continuance of the long series of such benefactions from him and \$9,000 from a most generous anonymous donor for the purchase of two rare books for Special Collections.

The presenting of funds for the purchase of books as memorial gifts has become increasingly popular. Since the first such gift was made in May, 1952, six members of the Friends have given a total of \$1,798 for this purpose. (Reprints of the article entitled "Books as Living Memorials" which appeared in the February, 1954, issue of *Columbia Library Columns* are available, upon request, from the Secretary of the Friends.)

The comparative figures for contributions by our members for the three years since the Friends of the Columbia Libraries came into existence are as follows:

1951-52 (June 1-May 30)	\$ 2,950.19
1952-53 (June 1-March 31)*	8,254.08
1953-54 (April 1-March 31)	15,380.50
Total	\$26,584.77

In addition to the gifts of funds, Friends have given an impressive number of books and manuscripts to the Libraries. The estimated total value of such gifts for the period from January

* Ten-month period. The reporting period was changed to April 1-March 31 to permit publication of annual totals in the May issue of the *Columns*.

1, 1951, to March 31, 1954, is \$99,811.17. (For Library record purposes, a valuation figure is secured for each item or group of items received from a donor. In the absence of specific valuation information, the staff supervisor who has the best knowledge of the subject field involved provides an unofficial estimate.) Some of the donors of books and manuscripts are now, as Friends, continuing generous benefactions to the Libraries which they started before our organization was formed.

Last year at this time our membership was 266; it is now about 280.

Meetings

On the evening of March 26 a meeting of the Friends was held at the home of Dr. Dallas Pratt at which Roland Baughman spoke on the forgeries of Thomas J. Wise, reviewing the investigations which led to the exposure of Wise's activities and describing the impact of the revelations at the Huntington Library where Mr. Baughman was at that time Associate Curator. Much of the substance of his talk is contained in his article in this issue of the *Columns*, plus discussion of the problems which bibliographers and scholars now face as a result of Mr. Wise's fabrications.

The Bancroft Award dinner, a notable literary event which is sponsored annually by the Friends of the Columbia Libraries, was held on April 20. As our members will recall, awards in the amount of \$2,000 each from the income of the Bancroft Foundation are made by the Trustees of Columbia University for the two books which the Bancroft Award Jury selects as having been the best published during the preceding year in the fields of American history, American diplomacy, or American international relations. The winning books this year are Clinton Rossiter's *Seedtime of the Republic*, and William L. Langer and S. Everett Gleason's *The Undeclared War*.

Mr. Lada-Mocarski presided, President Kirk presented the awards, and Mr. August Heckscher, chief editorial writer for the New York *Herald Tribune*, gave the main address.

THE FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA LIBRARIES

PRIVILEGES

Invitations to exhibitions, lectures and other special events.

Use of books in the reading rooms of the libraries.

Opportunity to consult Librarians, including those in charge of the specialized collections, about material of interest to a member. (Each Division Head has our members' names on file.)

Free subscription to COLUMBIA LIBRARY COLUMNS.

* * *

As a Friend of the Columbia Libraries you are asked to assume no specific obligations. We rely on your friendship towards our institution and its ideals. However, if members express their support through annual donations of books or other material, or cash, we shall have a tangible indication that our program to arouse interest in the pressing needs of the Libraries has been successful. All donations are deductible for income tax purposes.*

* Please make checks payable to Columbia University.

OFFICERS

VALERIEN LADA-MOCARSKI, *Chairman*

CHARLES W. MIXER, *Secretary-Treasurer*

Room 317, Butler Library, Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.

THE COUNCIL

SEYMOUR M. ADELMAN

FRANK ALTSCHUL

MRS. ALBERT M. BAER

HENRY ROGERS BENJAMIN

NORMAN COUSINS

WALTER D. FLETCHER

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE

AUGUST HECKSCHER

MRS. DONALD HYDE

VALERIEN LADA-MOCARSKI

MRS. FRANCIS H. LENYGON

DALLAS PRATT

MRS. FRANZ T. STONE

RICHARD H. LOGSDON

Director of Libraries, ex officio

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

DALLAS PRATT, *Editor*

NORMAN COUSINS

AUGUST HECKSCHER

CHARLES W. MIXER

